Mr. Laurence Stern
Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

Rt. 12, Frederick, Md. 21701
8/22/76

Dear Larry,

Because you began with a prejudice you were intended to have you never learned much about me. My earlier experiences include intelligence. I was an analyst. Also a trouble-shooter, with a rather good record. Before that I was a Senate investigator. There also I was a trouble-shooter. From this experience and from as intensive a 13 years of investigation and analysis as I believe is humanly possible since JFK was killed I suggest a simplification with which you may want to approach a key paragraph in your long Rosselli piece in today's Post: in a really tough investigation or in an xxxx analysis in which there are few or contradictory clues the best course is to sieze upon one and bulldog it to death.

In your piece this is:"It was not clear then - nor is to today - why Morgan came forward at that time to bring Rosselli's story to the ears of the nation's highest law enforcement authorities."

I had no doubt then and I have no doubt now. I'll give you one clue: what else was going on then?

There is virtually nothing new in your story. Confirmation that Morgan was the source is new as a fact but long ago he was my first guess. I've forgotten why and what his background is. (More recently, because of other reasons, I switched to a second lawyer but originally I did believe Morgan.)

If I believe you to be some kind of fink I'd not be taking this time. Last year, after 62 of exceptionally good health, I had pneumonia and pleurisy followed by a severe thrombisis, with permanent damage that for several weeks has been bothering me more than usual.

I do believe that not for the first time the Post has been used in a disinformation operation. In this your and the Post's motives are irrelevant. I don't think that Bradlee's bed is in Langley, either.

And frankly I'm glad your prejudices prevented your asking me anything because I have undertaken a very large work and I want to complete as much of it as is possible.

To an experienced analyst your factually completely correct story collapses from internal self-destructs. But part of the accuracy - which comes from accurate quotation and citation - is unfactual.

I'll try to simplify. It simply is not true that the Warren Commission did not know of unfollowed conspiracy leads of precisely this nature. And it is true that if the Post did not have policy determinations against me and my work this would have been widely known, if not for the first time, last November. That is when I brought out what you may regard as a long, tendentious, prolix work totled Post Mortem. Barry Sussman was here and I dsicssed it with him. He left with a copy. He found it too complicated for him and turned it over to George Lardner. So a copy is available there. But what I have in mind, pp. 475-87, esp. 485-7, earlier was a non-story to the Post's national desk.I'm sure Bill Claiborne and George will remember. My release of it in April 1975, after I got it under FOIA, after 7-8 years of effort, cpincided with the pneumonia. I went through with a scheduled press conference despite high fever.I gave Claiborne a copy of this transcript first and he discussed it with me afterward. He correctly chided me for understating. From my prior experience understatement seemed the better course. Perhaps I was wrong. But Bill did send that transcript to Washington and your national desk did read it and did not do a story. Nor did the Times nor any wire xxxx service that I can recall.

The earliest reporting of any of this is in the manuscript you refused to read in 1965. It is in my first book, which was finished in mid-February of that year. Turn to page 153. That section begins about 149. Not an awful lot to read.

Schweiker began with four theories and wound up with a single intention, to be Ford's vice-presidential candidate. My correspondence on this and with him is dated prior to Reagan's move. All four theories came from my work. I tried without success to talk him out of any theorizing but he was off and running. I warned him with precise accuracy of the results if he did. He called me when I was in acute pain. I spent a morning with him on the way to the hospital. The above citation is one of the four.

Over the years, often too late, I've re-evaluated my position and approach, asking myself how I may best come as close to possible to doing what I never intended to do when I wrote that first book. Literary considerations have come to be of least significance to me. I no longer take time to read and correct most letters. I mean no offense in this, but I'm 63, work a long day still and want to go as many of those miles as Frost wrote about. Less and less frequently do I undertake to try and alert the media to its being manipulated. It is a competitive world that depends on sources. This translates for the most part into officials - and the need to go back and to meet the competition. Policies evolve and are rationalized into news judgements. I can no more compete with this than I can with the whoring the Lanes. So I try to do my own thing. For years that has been a very determined effort to bring out what suppressed fact I can and make as complete a record as possible.

I have had FOIA requests filed for all the things you mention for long periods of time. Long enough to have them all in court. But I'm still only one man. I have only one overworked lawyer. I can't pay him and he is just starting practise. We now have three unreported - and I'm satisfied they are unreported cases in court. Without help, and that is as likely as shrimps whistling from the backs of cows jumping over green-cheese moons, I can move no faster. However, with the onset of sickness I did establish an estate and have every confidence that two very fine young men will carry these matters forward. I no longer have to tell myself that in this I serve the nation's interest. A federal court has so mandated. Naturally this was not news and I now don't want it to be. If I did I'd have gone to the papers.

I had an entirely different interest in the Rosselli story and for this reason I followed it. There has been persistent official lying about it from the outset. I'll give you a couple of recent examples before I return to my own work.

There never was a time when the FBI did not have investigational jurisdiction yet it stated it did not and would not investigate. All the time it was. I can but will not name one interviewed and where. Many police departments are involved in a Rosselli investigation. To my knowledge, from solid sources, not fewer than two have lied about this. One involves a very dubious character who as a policeman is a notorious murderer. Two other murders coincide with Rosselli's, perhaps only coincidentally. One involved chains and dumping the body in the deep. The other is ruled "natural causes" by the medical examiner and "suicide" by the police.

If I were to bulldog your story, as you should and I will not, from this single hasty reading I'd say that an experienced political analyst of non-Angletonian preconceptions would be satisfied that of all the people who could have been responsible for offing JFK Castro is the least likely. This would have been part of what I had intended as mys second book had it not been for the corrupt doctrines of the two books that immediately followed mine. They pinned it all on Warren. In my view if he bears his own faults be carries enough. There are sufficient to go around. Truth and goats are incompatible. This is a turning point in history. It requires truth and the acceptance of truth if there is to be a representative society of any kind.

Sincerely,